

## **REMARKS**

Pursuant to the telephone conference between the attorney of record and the Examiner on September 19, 2006 (“Conference”), the above amendments and following remarks are herein submitted. Claims 8 and 18 are amended. Support for the amendments can be found in, for example, figure 4a and the first full paragraph on page 10 of the Application. The Specification has been amended to clarify figure 4a as originally disclosed in the Application. As such, no new matter has been added.

A Replacement Drawing for figure 4a is being submitted to clarify the originally disclosed figure 4a in the Application pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d). The Replacement Drawing redirects the lines from reference number 306A originally directed to now-referenced 405A to the irregular shaped objects between heat spreader 301A and device 304A. This amendment is supported by the second full paragraph on page 9 of the originally-filed Application. The Replacement Drawing re-references the originally-referenced object 306A to reference 405A. This amendment is supported by figures 3a-3b of the originally-filed Application. As such, no new matter has been added.

As per agreement between the attorney of record and the Examiner during the Conference, independent claim 8 has been amended to include the limitation of “at least two stand-offs interdisposed between the surface of the heat spreader and the circuit substrate.” (App., claim 8) The cited references in the Office Action dated June 27, 2006 (“Office Action”), *Patel* and *Toy*, do not disclose, teach or suggest the limitation as recited in claim 8. Dependent claims 9-11 depend from independent claim 8 and therefore include all of its limitations. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8 and its respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

As per agreement between the attorney of record and the Examiner during the Conference, claim 18 has been amended to include the limitation of “at least two stand-offs interdisposed between the surface of the cover and the semiconductor device.” (App., claim 18) The cited references in the Office Action, *Patel* and *Toy*, do not disclose, teach or suggest the limitation as recited in claim 18. Dependent claims 19 and 24 depend from independent claim 18

and therefore include all of its limitations. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 18 and its respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 9/21/06

Shelley M. Cobos  
Shelley M. Cobos, Reg. No. 56,174

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
Telephone (310) 207-3800  
Facsimile (310) 820-5988

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Melissa Stead 9-21-06  
Melissa Stead Date